

Date: Mon, 5 Jul 93 04:30:15 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #216  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Mon, 5 Jul 93                      Volume 93 : Issue 216

Today's Topics:

                    Presence of control operator  
                    Rptr trustee id (3 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----  
Date: Mon, 5 Jul 1993 02:55:56 GMT  
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!csc.ti.com!tilde.csc.ti.com!skitzo.dseg.ti.com!ernest!  
cmptrc!carter@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Presence of control operator  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <20t1b6INNbm1@west.west.sun.com> flloyd@l1-a.west.sun.com (Fred Lloyd  
[Phoenix SE]) writes:

>  
>The club station call is a good example where nobody's personally  
>responsible. The first time I operated at a club-call FD station  
>(W6OTX - Palo Alto), they flatly stated that any operator with any  
>class could operate on any band under the club callsign. This did  
>not include the novice tent which had its own callsign.

Actually, the club call-sign trustee and each control operator were  
responsible, whether they knew it or not, or admitted it or not.

But, you're right Fred, since they are the one's that are going to have  
to bear the responsibility for the stations emissions, let's let them  
determine how much control they need to ensure it.

>The FD band privlidge extension is now accepted practice. Deal with it.

None of the operators in our group have accepted it. Most of the ones who have accepted it are not lids, though. They just don't understand the rules.

>Lets face it: to be leagal it would probably be necessary to say:

>

>CQ Field Day, CQ Field Day, this is KB1xxx/W1xx

No. Rules for multiple call signs have been relaxed since Part 97 was rewritten.

>There are a lot of rules to which the throbbing masses give additional  
>lattitude during field day. I've seen many hams (ahem) "relax" their  
>on-air ethics for Field Day in particular. Hmmm, perhaps I'm putting  
>it too nicely. Many hams completely ignore "good amateur practice" and  
>routinely transmit over weaker stations, jam their callsigns in between  
>changeovers, and in general, create a din worse than channel 19 on a  
>good skip day. But overall, most will report that despite being  
>occasionally jammed that they still had FUN. To me, that's why we do  
>ham radio in the first place. Bravo I say!

>

>[ Fred Lloyd, AA7BQ

It depresses me that an Extra Class Licensee would hold such low regard for Good Amateur Practice. To have you describe the above scenario and say that it would be okay if everyone "still had FUN" makes me sad.

I have been told often that the spirit of Amateur Radio is dying. I have heard it said that the old-timers are leaving, and the ranks of our beloved hobby are swarming with technopunks who want nothing more than Hi-Fi Citizen's Band.

But it is not true.

I have seen that No-Code Technicians can take great interest and pride in their signal quality when their Elmers impress the importance of it upon them.

I have actually met a Novice who cared that his CW weighting is correct and in good form.

I have seen Generals and Advanced class operators who actually continued to study their hobby after they passed their exams.

And I have seen operators at all levels who continually work to make

Amateur Radio a "Service" as it is referred to in Part 97.

But perhaps this is because I live in 5-land.

--

Carter R. Bennett, Jr. - Scientist | "Oh my God! I \_AM\_ a nerd!!!"  
carter@scilab.lonestar.org - home | - C. Bennett, Sept 25, 1992, after  
carter@cmptrc.lonestar.org - work | realizing he had been talking about  
KI5SR | "market availability of preconfigured Toll-House cookies."

-----

Date: Sun, 4 Jul 1993 22:45:55 GMT  
From: swrinde!gatech!news-feed-1.peachnet.edu!darwin.sura.net!newsserver.jvnc.net!  
newsserver.egr.uri.edu!orca!swamik@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Rptr trustee id  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Hi

A few months ago, the old trustee of our local rptr never use to  
id when he was on the machine. He claimed that since the rptr sent  
his call every 10 min in CW he did not have to. Is this OK?  
The rptr identified as his call /R. Therefor the rptr idd itself  
not hime right?

KB1AMB

-----

Date: Sun, 4 Jul 1993 23:19:33 GMT  
From: psinntp!iat.holonet.net!bwilkins@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Rptr trustee id  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

swamik@orca.NoSubdomain.NoDomain (Swami Kumaresan) writes:

: Hi  
:  
: A few months ago, the old trustee of our local rptr never use to  
: id when he was on the machine. He claimed that since the rptr sent  
: his call every 10 min in CW he did not have to. Is this OK?  
: The rptr identified as his call /R. Therefor the rptr idd itself  
: not hime right?  
:  
: KB1AMB

You are correct in your assumption. The trustee must identify his own  
transmitter with each use.



References <C9HqCC.MrK@bigtop.dr.att.com>,  
<1993Jul2.183852.4804@CslI.Stanford.EDU>, <C9K996.7vL@fc.hp.com>  
Subject : Re: NQ0I Case : HF Vertical Antennas

perry@fc.hp.com (Perry Scott) writes:

]Paul Flaherty (paulf@CslI.Stanford.EDU) wrote:

] : n2ic@druwa.att.com writes:

] : >The real solution is for the FCC to modify PRB-1, so it's not so

] : >wishy-washy.

] : Having so stated, what modifications would you make to PRB-1?

]How about minimum height requirements for each band? To be in the  
]public interest (e.g. during the SFO quake a few years back), this  
]should be adequate for reaching anywhere in the US from anywhere in the  
]US. Your mileage may vary.

]Here's my straw man.

]40m: 60'

]20m: 30'

]10m: 15'

A couple of problems:

- (1) Federal courts would almost surely throw this out
- (2) HF communications are becoming less and less critical for emergency communications. In the US today, about the only time they are useful for emergency traffic is during a hurricane (when the severe weather hampers movement and destroys towers holding VHF/UHF systems).

In most emergencies in the US, one can expect that emergency communications will be handled on VHF/UHF through repeaters (not requiring high or large antennas) and (gasp) cellular phone. Health and welfare traffic will be mostly unnecessary because the phone companies are so good at putting long distance phone systems back together very quickly.

International emergencies are another matter - the Mexico City earthquake required emergency communications intermittently on HF bands (mostly 20M) for several days, and H&W traffic for about 10 days. However, this was a very special case, because ALL long distance traffic into Mexico City went into a single building, and that building was not earthquake hardened.

However, international emergency communication is not nearly as powerful an argument for ham towers throughout the US. Only a few stations, easily

put at commercially zoned facilities (such as Red Cross offices or military armories) are required.

On the other hand, the military did testify in our Phoenix antenna ordinance case that they considered amateur stations to be part of the national disaster communications system. I don't know if they do today.

Finally, a flame...

We are behaving just like every other special interest group in appealing to the Federal Government to resolve what is a LOCAL problem. I don't know about you, but I would just as soon the Federal Government didn't tell my local government how to operate (except for upholding the constitution).

--

John Moore NJ7E, 7525 Clearwater Pkwy, Scottsdale, AZ 85253 (602-951-9326)  
john@anasazi.com ncar!noao!asuvax!anasaz!john anasaz!john@asuvax.eas.asu.edu  
- - Support ALL ...erk glugh mmpph.... Memory fault (core dumped)

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #216

\*\*\*\*\*